

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Patent Application of:	)
Shunpei YAMAZAKI et al.	) Group Art Unit: 1763
Application No. 10/820,130	) Examiner: Karla A. Moore
Filed: April 8, 2004	) Confirmation No. 8630
For: MASK AND CONTAINER AND MANUFACTURING APPARATUS	) Date: August 17, 2007

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

**Mail Stop Amendment**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In reply to the May 17, 2007, Office Action, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims. Claims 1-7 and 17-28 currently are pending, with claims 1, 17 and 20 being independent and claims 4-7 and 23-28 being withdrawn from consideration.

In the most recent Office Action, claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,356,686 to Fujioka et al. (Fujioka). Further, claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fujioka as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, in view of Japanese Patent No. 05341502A to Sekimoto et al. (Sekimoto). Still further, claims 17, 19-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fujioka in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,475,287 to Clark (Clark). Finally, claims 18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Fujioka and Clark as applied to claims 17, 19-20 and 22 above, and further in view of Sekimoto. Each of these rejections is respectfully traversed in that Fujioka, taken alone or in combination with Sekimoto or Clark, fails to disclose or suggest that which is presently set forth by Applicants' claimed invention.

As set forth in MPEP § 706.02, for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. § 102 the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. Since each and every element, as set forth in the claims, is not found either expressly or inherently described as required by the M.P.E.P., Fujioka fails to anticipate the exemplary features of the present invention, as presently claimed for the reasons set forth below.

With respect to independent claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Fujioka discloses the claimed invention. However, it appears that Fujioka discloses only that the mask substrate is fixed to the supporting frame by means of an adhesive agent (col. 2, line 66-67 of Fujioka), but does not teach the features of “wherein said mask body is fixed to said frame in a stretched state and said mask body is adhesively bonded in a location coinciding with a line passing through a thermal expansion center in members of said frame,” as presently claimed. Thus, it cannot be said that Fujioka anticipates the invention as claimed.

With respect to independent claims 17 and 20, the Examiner asserts that Fujioka in combination with Clark makes obvious the claimed invention. The Examiner asserts that Clark teaches using a mask and frame apparatus for the purpose of permitting selective deposition from a deposition source situated below the mask, frame and a deposition substrate (Abstract of Clark). However, claims 17 and 20 recite, *inter alia*, the features of “wherein said mask body is adhesively bonded to said mask frame in a location coinciding with a line passing through a thermal expansion center of said mask frame.” Clark fails to teach or suggest the features of wherein said mask body is adhesively bonded to said mask frame in a location coinciding with a line passing through a thermal expansion center of said mask frame, as presently claimed. Thus, Clark does not overcome the deficiencies of Fujioka as discussed above, thus, it cannot be said that Fujioka in combination with Clark makes obvious the invention as claimed.

Fujioka, Sekimoto and/or Clark, taken alone or in combination, fail to anticipate or make obvious the present invention, as claimed. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 17 and 20 are allowable as discussed previously. Further, any

claim that depends from an allowable claim is allowable as well. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claims 2-3, 18-19 and 21-22 likewise be removed.

Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit the Section 102 and Section 103 rejections fail to anticipate or make obvious the pending rejected claims 1-3 and 17-22. As such, the rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean A. Pryor, Reg. # 48103/  
Sean A. Pryor

**NIXON PEABODY LLP**  
CUSTOMER NO.: 22204  
Suite 900, 401 9<sup>th</sup> Street N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 585-8000